

WARREN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

COMMITTEE: PUBLIC WORKS (DPW, AIRPORT AND PARKS, RECREATION & RAILROAD)

DATE: FEBRUARY 1, 2008

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

SUPERVISORS Belden
Bentley
Tessier
Stec
Merlino
Haskell
Champagne

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

SUPERVISORS Taylor
Goodspeed

OTHERS PRESENT:

REPRESENTING DPW:

William Lamy, Superintendent

Jeffrey Tennyson, Deputy Superintendent of
Engineering

REPRESENTING THE FLOYD BENNETT MEMORIAL AIRPORT:

Marshall Stevens, Manager

REPRESENTING PARKS, RECREATION & RAILROAD:

Paul Butler, Director

Tim Benway, Recreation Facilities Manager

Frederick Monroe, Chairman

Paul Dusek, County Attorney

Joan Sady, Clerk

JoAnn McKinstry, Deputy Commissioner of Administrative
& Fiscal Services

SUPERVISORS Geraghty

Thomas

Strainer

Joanne Collins, Legislative Office Specialist

Robert Singer, Glens Falls Owners & Pilots Association

Donald Hess, Glens Falls Owners & Pilots Association

Kim Lussier, Empire East Aviation, Inc.

George Thurston, Partnership Sales Operation

Tom Randall, *The Adirondack Journal*

Amanda Allen, Sr. Legislative Office Specialist

Mr. Belden called the meeting of the Public Works Committee to order at 9:30 a.m.

Motion was made by Mr. Haskell, seconded by Mr. Bentley and carried unanimously to approve the minutes from the November 28, 2007 DPW Committee meeting, as well as the January 4, 2008 and January 14, 2008 Public Works Committee meetings, subject to correction by the Clerk of the Board.

Privilege of the floor was extended to William Lamy, DPW Superintendent, who distributed copies of the agenda to the Committee members. *A copy of the agenda is on file with the minutes.*

Mr. Lamy apprised that agenda item one referred to a series of personnel requests which began on page two with a chart of existing Highway and Bridges staff. He pointed out that the column of this chart entitled "So. End" reflected two MEO (Motor Equipment Operator-Light) vacancies and he reminded the Committee that they had previously given approval to fill these positions; however, he said, he had delayed filling them and was trying to get through the winter season without doing so. Mr. Lamy then directed the Committee to the section labeled "North Creek" which reflected a vacant HEO (Heavy Equipment Operator) position, due to a retirement effective January 12th and also a vacant MEO (Motor Equipment Operator-Medium) position, due to resignation. He advised that page three of the agenda included a letter of explanation detailing his

personnel requests which included a request to fill the HEO position, base salary \$28,697, at the North Creek shop through the promotion of an employee currently filling an MEO position, and also the need to subsequently fill the MEO-medium position, base salary \$27,559, which would be left vacant through this promotion. Mr. Lamy added that he was also requesting permission to fill the MEO-light position, base salary \$25,032, which was vacant due to resignation.

Mr. Lamy apprised that the agenda included additional requests to fill the vacant positions of Senior Custodian, base salary \$30,867, vacant due to a transfer, and Janitor #3, base salary \$24,059 which might become vacant due to promotion. He said that there was a listing of Civil Service tested individuals to be considered in filling the Senior Custodian position; however, if they were unable to find an appropriate person to fill the job from this list, they would promote from within for this position, leaving the Janitor #3 position vacant. Mr. Lamy stated that although he was unsure which route would be taken to fill the Senior Custodian position, he was asking for permission to fill both positions in order to account for both scenarios.

Motion was made by Mr. Haskell, seconded by Mr. Tessier and carried unanimously to approve the requests to fill all five positions (*Heavy Equipment Operator #6, base salary \$28,697; MEO-Medium, base salary \$27,559; MEO-Light, base salary \$25,032; MEO-Light #21, base salary \$25,032; Senior Custodian, base salary \$30,867 and Janitor #3, base salary \$24,059*) and refer same to the Personnel Committee. *Copies of all five requests are on file with the minutes.*

Mr. Lamy explained that agenda page 11 reflected an additional personnel related request to correct a title listed incorrectly in the salary schedule and amend the DPW Table of Organization. He explained that the Salary Schedule in the 2008 Budget currently listed a position entitled "Assistant Shop Supervisor" although the actual Civil Service title for the position was "Assistant Auto Mechanic Supervisor". Mr. Lamy noted that this correction had been requested by Richard Kelly, Personnel Officer, to correct the Salary Schedule and the Table of Organization for DPW.

Motion was made by Mr. Haskell, seconded by Mr. Stec and carried unanimously to approve the request to amend the Salary Schedule and the DPW Table of Organization to correct the title of Assistant Auto Mechanic Supervisor as outlined above and refer same to the Personnel Committee. *A copy of the request is on file with the minutes.*

Mr. Lamy advised that page 12 of the agenda included a request for transfer of funds in the amount of \$129,348 from Code D.5112.8036 280 (CR#12 Hadley Road) to Code D.5112.8006 280 (CR#3 Warrensburg Road). He explained that this request was the result of a suggestion made by Mr. Thomas during the 2008 Budget process during which he stated his preference to see repairs made to Warrensburg Road, in the Town of Stony Creek, completed prior to those planned for Hadley Road, in the Town of Stony Creek. Mr. Lamy added that Mr. Thomas had expressed that the Warrensburg Road project was more important as it was much more heavily traveled by his constituents than Hadley Road because it was the main corridor from Warrensburg to Stony Creek. Mr. Lamy advised that there was a section of Warrensburg Road that sat high above the railroad and would require some bank stabilization work, as it had in the past.

Motion was made by Mr. Haskell, seconded by Mr. Bentley and carried unanimously to approve the request to transfer \$129,348 from Code D.5112.8036 280 (CR#12 Hadley Road) to Code D.5112.8006 208 (Warrensburg Road) and refer same to the Finance Committee. *A copy of the request is on file with the minutes.*

Mr. Lamy advised that agenda page 13 reflected a second request for transfer of funds in the amount of \$100,000 from Code D.5112.8100 280 (CR#17 Haviland/Meadowbrook Road) to Code DM5130 260 (Road Machinery-Other Equipment). He explained that during the 2008 Budget process they had discussed funding options for the purchase of DPW equipment for 2008 and into the future and had talked about whether the money should be included in the Budget for these purchases or bonded. The final decision, Mr. Lamy stated, had been to bond the equipment requested for both 2008 and 2009 and, unfortunately, by the time they had made this decision and determined what items could be bonded and which could not, it became difficult to correct the Budget prior to its adoption. He said that at that time in his discussion with Hal Payne, Commissioner of Administrative & Fiscal Services, and with the Budget Officer, the decision had been made to leave the Budget as it was and address the issues in 2008.

Mr. Lamy advised that when developing the DPW Budget and estimating the amounts required for equipment purchases, they also estimated the costs of the "add-on" items necessary to perform DPW functions which did not come with the piece of equipment being purchased. He explained that these additional estimated costs were traditionally included under the Road Machinery-Other Equipment Code; he added that, historically, the Code had also included appropriated funds that allowed for the purchase of equipment not associated with vehicles. Mr. Lamy said that when the decision was made to bond the equipment purchased for 2008 and 2009, all of their equipment codes, including the Road Machinery-Other Equipment Code, were zeroed out. He advised that this matter came to his attention when the need to purchase pumps to add lubricant additives to their fuel tanks had arisen and there were no funds available in the Budget to make those purchases. Mr. Lamy apprised that there were also a couple of vehicles necessary which were classified as non-equipment purchases; therefore, they could not be bonded; he added that in the past these purchases would have been made with funds from the Road Machinery-Other Equipment Code.

In order to further define this issue, Mr. Lamy advised that he had directed Bruce Belden, Auto Mechanic Supervisor, to develop a list, *which was included on page 14 of the agenda*, of items that would be necessary as "add-ons" to bonded equipment, as well as items that had traditionally been purchased through the Other Equipment Code. He said that in speaking with Paul Dusek, County Attorney, he had been advised that there might be some items listed that could be bonded and Mr. Dusek wanted to review the list to make this determination. Although the listing developed by Mr. B. Belden totaled \$159,375, Mr. Lamy advised that the \$100,000 included in his transfer request would allow him to purchase the two vehicles that could not be bonded, as well as allow funding to be added to the Road Machinery-Other Equipment Code to allow his Department to continue to do business. In the meantime, he said, he would look to Mr. Dusek to determine which of the items listed could be included in the bond to reduce the total to a figure less than the \$100,000 he intended to transfer.

Mr. Lamy apprised that because they were able to complete the Haviland/Meadowbrook Project (Code D.5112.8100 280) with County staff, rather than bidding the project out to an independent contractor, it had cost considerably less than what had been budgeted. He said that although there was still some work left to be completed on the project, there was approximately \$100,000 that would not be used and he suggested that it be transferred to the Road Machinery-Other Equipment Code as his Department could not properly do business without funding in this category.

Mr. Belden noted that Mr. Lamy's listing included an allowance for 18 backup alarms and he asked if the equipment purchased came equipped with these. Mr. Lamy replied that he was not sure why these items had been included as he had not developed the listing and he would defer this question to Mr. B. Belden;

however, he noted, Mr. B. Belden had produced the list based on the needs for “add-ons” for the new equipment being bonded. Mr. Haskell interjected that the Town of Thurman replacement of backup alarms was necessary because they did wear out frequently and he added that this was also the case with the strobe lights mounted on their vehicles. Mr. Belden then noted that the listing included costs for a utility body and he asked if they could not purchase a truck and utility body as one unit and Mr. Lamy replied that, once again, he would have to defer to Mr. B. Belden with regard to this matter because he was not sure. Mr. Lamy reiterated that he had asked Mr. B. Belden to review the equipment purchases for 2008 and 2009 and develop a listing of the items they would expect to have to purchase to accompany these items. Mr. Belden asked if the purchase of a truck and utility body as one unit would qualify for bonding and Mr. Dusek replied affirmatively. Mr. Lamy advised that because this issue had only been discovered recently, there had not been sufficient time to review the issues with Mr. Dusek to determine which items could be bonded and which could not, prior to the Committee meeting. He noted that for 2007 \$64,000 had been Budgeted in the Road Machinery-Other Equipment Code and for 2008 nothing had been budgeted, which made it impossible for his Department to continue to operate efficiently. Mr. Lamy added that items had already been purchased in 2008 that they were not able to pay for because there was no money in the Other Equipment Code. He said that he believed this was a middle of the road approach to solve the issue and he noted that he was certainly willing to bond any and all qualified DPW necessities.

Mr. Belden noted that the list of necessary equipment totaled \$159,375, while the transfer requested was only for \$100,000 and he asked if the remaining \$59,375 could be transferred from another Budget Code. Mr. Lamy replied that it was his hope that once the list was reviewed by Mr. Dusek and the Bond Attorney they would be able to include some of the items listed into the bond to reduce the amount needed to less than the \$100,000 transferred. He said that if they could not do this he would have to re-evaluate the situation and return to the Committee for further discussion.

Mr. Dusek asked if some of these costs were already included in the amount estimated for the bond and Mr. Lamy replied that he believed some were because when they had prepared cost estimates for the equipment purchases they had included the costs for the “add-on” items necessary. Mr. Dusek said that if this was not the case they would have to do another bond resolution to cover the additional costs and then add the bonds together when they were sold so that there would be no additional cost to the County. Mr. Lamy said that they would have a better idea of the exact amount needed once Mr. Dusek and the Bond Attorney had determined which of the items listed could be included on the bond. Mr. Dusek stated that in his brief review of the listing it appeared that there were quite a few things that could be included in the bond to easily reach the \$59,375 figure needed to fund all of the items needed.

Mr. Belden directed Mr. Lamy to work with Mr. Dusek to include as many of the items listed as possible in the equipment bond.

Motion was made by Mr. Haskell, seconded by Mr. Tessier and carried unanimously to approve the request for transfer of funds in the amount of \$100,000 from Code 5112.8100 280 (CR#17 Haviland/Meadowbrook Rd) to Code DM5130 260 (Road Machinery-Other Equipment) and refer same to the Finance Committee. *A copy of the request is on file with the minutes.*

Mr. Champagne reminded Mr. Lamy that a few years prior the Committee had met with Mr. Lamy’s IT (Information Technology) staff to discuss the addition of a computer system that would keep better track of supplies, equipment, services, etcetera and he asked if that system had been implemented. Mr. Lamy replied that the computer system had not been upgraded to this extent and to do so would cost approximately

\$25,000, due to inconsistencies between their various computer systems and software used. He said that although this item was viewed as a necessity, it was not very high on the list of the Department's requirements. Mr. Belden noted that although the extensive upgrades had not been made, the tracking system used was much better than it had been in the past.

Mr. Champagne stated that in light of the extensive equipment needs listed he did not see how the DPW could operate. He apprised that during a recent storm he had seen a County plow truck with a plow that had a hole rusted through the middle and he did not think that it should even be on the road. Mr. Champagne asked why plows were not included on the listing presented and Mr. Lamy replied that the tandem trucks and plows were already included in the bond.

Discussion ensued.

JoAnn McKinstry, Deputy Commissioner of Administrative & Fiscal Services, asked how purchases for 2008 were made if there was no money in the Other Equipment Budget Code and Mr. Lamy replied that this was due to a glitch that they had since realized and would be corrected through this transfer. He added that luckily the purchases had been for a minor amount.

Moving on, Mr. Lamy directed the Committee members to page 15 of the agenda which consisted of a map of CR#62 which crossed over an outlet at the lower end of Schroon Lake. He noted that years ago the County had a bridge that a cement truck fell through, resulting in a new bridge and the realignment of the road. Mr. Lamy said that he had received an inquiry with regard to acquisition of a piece of the County ROW (right-of-way) by a landowner adjacent to this property who was looking to open a marina. He said that he did not have any further information with regard to the matter but he wanted the Committee to be aware of the situation for future discussion. Mr. Lamy stated that it was his feeling that the property was excess and not needed by the County; therefore, if it was determined as such by the Board, they might consider conveying the property to the landowner in order to advance their marina project. Jeffery Tennyson, Deputy Superintendent of Engineering, apprised that in working with the gentleman who was trying to gain the property it appeared that the transfer might not be necessary, as they were currently working on the feasibility of the marina project which was required to proceed further. He said that at this point he felt the project would not be advancing any time soon. Mr. Lamy stated that they would keep the Committee abreast of any new information with regard to the matter in future Committee meetings.

Mr. Lamy apprised that the next agenda item listed was Computer Equipment. He explained that during the 2008 Budget process DPW had put forth some computer and software needs, at which time the costs for these needs were moved into Capital Project H108.9550 280, which was administered through the County IT Department. In speaking with Mr. Payne about how funds from that Capital Project could be accessed, it was suggested that he bring the matter back to the Committee for permission to gain those funds, Mr. Lamy advised. He said that the funds requested totaled \$19,350 and would address about half of their computer needs.

Mr. Geraghty noted that if this amount would cover only half of the DPW software needs, it might be better to perform all of the computer upgrades, including the \$25,000 necessary to upgrade the tracking and inventory system, at the same time to save the County money and make the Department more efficient. Mr. Champagne agreed with this suggestion, as the upgraded inventory and fleet management system would certainly increase the efficiency of the Department. Mr. Haskell stated that DPW had asked for these funds for some time but they were removed each year during the Budget process. He agreed that funds should be

expended to upgrade the software as necessary; however, he said the Supervisors should keep this in mind each year during the Budget process when cutting costs. Mr. Belden suggested Mr. Geraghty and Mr. Lamy work together to determine if appropriate funding could be found within the existing Budget to fund all of the software needs of DPW.

Motion was made by Mr. Haskell, seconded by Mr. Stec and carried unanimously to authorize Mr. Lamy to contact Robert Metthe, Director of Information Technology, in order to gain the \$19,350 in funding for software needs that were moved from the DPW Budget to Capital Project H108.9550 280.

Mr. Lamy advised that the next agenda item referred to the Stormwater Maintenance Plan and he asked Mr. Dusek to address this item. Mr. Dusek reminded the Committee that the Board of Supervisors had recently adopted a Local Law regulating discharges into the stormwater sewer system as per a State mandate. He said that there was a second State requirement that went along with this, which he had mentioned when they first broached the subject, that required urbanized areas to adopt land use requirements for the management of stormwater. Mr. Dusek said that although it might seem that this was a Town matter, rather than a County concern, because the Towns were in charge of ordinance and things of that nature, it was the policy of the State that while the County was not going to be required to adopt zoning ordinances regulating stormwater, they would be required to adopt regulations to govern stormwater pollution in urbanized areas.

Mr. Dusek distributed a draft copy of the recommended policy, *a copy of which is on file with the minutes*. He explained that the policy stated that there would not be any land development in urbanized areas, meaning primarily the Town of Queensbury and the City of Glens Falls, and if any development qualifying under the policy were undertaken, the County would be required to put together a stormwater management plan. Mr. Dusek said that this plan would require involved contractors to certify that they had read the plan and agreed to comply with it. In addition, he noted, there were certain areas of the policy that required additional measures for sites where stormwater runoff from land development activities would disturb five acres or more, as well as other criteria set forth in the policy that had to be complied with.

Mr. Dusek said that the policy would allow for certain exceptions, but also required certain maintenance, inspection and repairs which tied in with Local Law requirements of a Stormwater Management Officer who would be responsible for compliance with this policy. He advised that this policy would keep all of the work done in the urbanized areas specified in compliance with the stormwater requirements; he added that this policy would apply to not only DPW projects, but also to the proposed Health & Human Services Building Project. Mr. Dusek noted that this policy would only apply as the County functioned in the areas specified, while the Town of Queensbury and the City of Glens Falls would be required to adopt their own Local Laws pertaining to stormwater management.

Mr. Stec apprised that although the Town of Queensbury had prepared a draft of the required Local Law for stormwater management, their attorney had suggested that they simply adopt the State draft because it was the easiest way to demonstrate the State's requirements and he suggested that the County do the same.

He said that if the County and Town adopted similar policies the regulations would be much easier to enforce and the Town and County might also consider an inter-municipal agreement to hire a Stormwater Management Officer in order to comply with State mandates and share the costs of the position in the process. Mr. Belden noted that this was a good idea and they should suggest that the City of Glens Falls join in the agreement to share a portion of the costs also. Mr. Champagne stated that since the Stormwater Management Officer would only be used by the County in projects undertaken by them and for related

inspections it did not appear that a full-time employee would be needed by the County. He suggested that it might be more economically feasible to let the Town of Queensbury employ this person and the County could reimburse for the services rendered on an as-needed basis.

Mr. Dusek stated that this policy was drafted based on the State model, although he had to make certain adjustments as the State model was for a law and the County version would be a policy. He said that it was very close to the State's model except for the exceptions added for the County's benefit for allowances unique to highways, roads and things of that nature. Because this was only a policy, Mr. Dusek stated, there was no need for a Public Hearing and the Board of Supervisors could simply adopt it as policy. He added that subsequent to the introduction of the Stormwater Management Officer the policy could be altered to make the policy work better for the County as the Officer saw fit.

Mr. Stec advised that the Town of Queensbury's draft policy differed from the State's in that a portion of the Town was located in the Lake George Watershed Basin which required a different set of regulations, and the Town would acknowledge these regulations through the inclusion of an addendum to the policy which stated such. Mr. Belden asked when the County's policy would be in place and Mr. Dusek advised that the although the State had initially wanted the policy in place by January of 2008, they had no issue with it being completed slightly later in February.

Mr. Champagne asked if the implementation of the policy should be held until the Town of Queensbury had theirs in place and Mr. Dusek replied in the negative, explaining that because they were subject to an enforcement action for not meeting the State's deadlines it was best to adopt the policy as soon as possible. He added that because this was simply a policy adopted by the Board of Supervisors it would be very easy to amend it as needed in the future.

Motion was made by Mr. Haskell, seconded by Mr. Champagne and carried unanimously to approve the draft of the Stormwater Management Policy as presented by Mr. Dusek and the necessary resolution was authorized for the February 15th Board meeting.

Proceeding to the next agenda item, Mr. Lamy advised that on page 16 he had included a copy of the letter he had received from NYSDOT (New York State Department of Transportation) with regard to work planned for the Spring of 2009. He said that the letter explained that they had begun preliminary design work for two I-87 bridges crossing Schroon River and East Schroon River Roads and those roads might require temporary closing during the bridge work. Mr. Lamy stated that he was presenting this information for the Committee's edification and future consideration.

Mr. Lamy stated that agenda page 17 included a copy of an email from George Drellos, Rally Director of the Soapbox Derby, in which he requested the use of Bay Road in the Town of Queensbury, in front of ACC (Adirondack Community College) on May 3 & 4 from 6:30 a.m. to 6:30 p.m. for the Soapbox Derby Rally Race. He noted that this was the same site they had used last year and because the event had been so successful they would like to use it again. Mr. Belden asked if anyone had spoken with Sheriff York about the road closing and Mr. Stec replied that he had and Sheriff York had advised that they would be happy to provide the necessary services, although he asked that he be reminded closer to the date of the event.

Motion was made by Mr. Merlino, seconded by Mr. Stec and carried unanimously to authorize DPW and the Sheriff's Office to proceed with the road closure as outlined above.

Mr. Lamy advised that agenda page 18 reflected a copy of the letter received from the Town of Queensbury advising of a rate increase for the Queensbury Avenue sanitary sewer district that included the Airport complex. He said that he had not had the opportunity to calculate the cost impact but would do so for the next month's Committee meeting.

A copy of the letter received from Mark Kennedy, NYSDOT Regional Traffic Engineer, regarding speed data for West Mountain Rd. was included on page 19 of the agenda Mr. Lamy apprised. He said that the letter summarized their analysis of the speed traveled on West Mountain Rd. and noted that regardless of the fact that the speed limit had been lowered, as per their request, it was still being exceeded by drivers. Mr. Lamy said that it appeared that the Sheriff's Office had also received a copy of the letter and that this seemed to be an enforcement issue that should be referred to them.

Mr. Tennyson advised that agenda pages 20 through 33 pertained to routine resolution request for work relating to the Grist Mill Road and Tannery Road Bridges, which were federal aid projects, and he detailed them as follows:

- 1) Request to increase Capital Project H259.9550 280 (Grist Mill Rd. Bridge over Stony Creek) in the amount of \$53,570 with the source of funding to be the NYSDOT Supplemental Master Agreement (\$25,280 *Federal funding*; \$27,750 *State funding*; *no change in Local match*) to advance the ROW phase of the project;
- 2) Request to extend the existing contract with Foit-Albert Associates in the amount of \$19,380 for Advanced Detail Plan revisions required to advance Capital Project H259.9550 280 (Grist Mill Rd. Bridge over Stony Creek) with the cost sharing aspects of the Federal aid project to be 80% Federal Share, 15% State Share and 5% Local Share (*Local Share is \$969*);
- 3) Request to increase Capital Project H258.9550 280 (Tannery Rd. Bridge over Stony Creek) in the amount of \$61,500 with the source of funding to be the NYSDOT Supplemental Master Agreement (\$27,000 *Federal funding*; \$34,500 *State funding*; *no change in Local match*) to advance the ROW phase of the project;
- 4) Request to extend the existing contract with Foit-Albert Associates in the amount of \$26,520 for Advanced Detail Plan revisions required to advance the Capital Project H258.9550 280 (Tannery Rd. Bridge over Stony Creek) with the cost sharing aspects of the Federal aid project to be 80% Federal Share, 15% State Share and 5% Local Share (*Local Share is \$1,325*).

Motion was made by Mr. Stec, seconded by Mr. Bentley and carried unanimously to approve both of the requests to increase Capital projects (*as listed in items 1 and 3 above*) and refer same to the Finance Committee. *Copies of both requests are on file with the minutes.*

Motion was made by Mr. Stec, seconded by Mr. Bentley and carried unanimously to approve the requests to extend both contracts with Foit-Albert Associates (*as listed in items 2 and 4 above*) and the necessary resolutions were authorized for the February 15th Board meeting. *Copies of both requests are on file with the minutes.*

Mr. Tennyson proceeded with a brief update on the status of the Corinth Road Project. He reminded the Committee that at the end of 2007 they had held an informative meeting on the Project wherein they had discussed the ROW process, as well as the need for a decision by the Town of Queensbury on the undergrounding of utilities in order for the Project to proceed. Mr. Tennyson stated that the Town of Queensbury had reached a decision and were now in the process of scheduling a combined Public Hearing

on the project which they expected to occur in either the end of February or the beginning of March. The good news, he said, was that the Town had made a decision and they were moving forward with the Project. Mr. Stec apprised that Town of Queensbury Board members had met in a workshop setting to discuss the project and had made the decision to move forward with the undergrounding of utilities along the Project route at their own cost, subsequently pursuing litigation to recover the funds expended. Mr. Belden stated that he hoped to see construction on the Corinth Road Project begin in 2009 and Mr. Stec replied that they may even see the utility undergrounding process begin late in 2008.

Mr. Lamy stated that the most important issue from the County's prospective was that the Project started as one related to traffic and the traffic issues were still prevalent and had not been solved. He added that regardless of the fact that the Committee and the Board of Supervisors had made the Corinth Road Project their number one priority for traffic issues, the project had remained in the engineering phase longer than anticipated and construction costs had increased. Mr. Lamy said that they had leveraged other road projects at the Adirondack-Glens Falls Transportation Council to gain funding to offset those cost increases. He added that the Committee and the Board had also advanced the Beach Road Project, in the Village of Lake George, as their second priority for transportation issues and if the Project did begin soon, there would be no other sources to borrow against to cover additional cost increases. Mr. Lamy said that at the Winter Conference held during the prior week, a presentation on construction costs had reflected a State-wide increase of 9.2% over the past five years. He said that they were responsible for about \$8 million in highway funding anticipated for the project and it was important to keep in mind that a one-year delay at a 9.2% increase would end up in a \$700,000 cost increase with no easy solution to cover the costs increases. Mr. Lamy stated that he wanted to be sure that the Committee members were aware of these cost increase issues and he noted that this matter had also been explained to the Queensbury Town Board members at their workshop meeting.

Moving on, Mr. Tennyson distributed a chart reflecting the condition ratings for bridges in Warren County, *a copy of which is on file with the minutes*. He explained that the chart represented a graphical representation of how decisions were made as to what bridges received TIP (Transportation Improvement Plan) funding from NYSDOT and which received the normal two-year inspections. Mr. Tennyson stated that they would begin construction on the Milton Street Bridge first, with that project beginning hopefully towards the end of 2008 while the Middleton and Alder Brook Bridge projects would begin later, as they were only in the beginning stages of planning for these projects. He said that they were in the process of selecting a consultant for the Alder Brook Bridge, while a consultant had already been chosen for the Middleton Bridge project. Mr. Tennyson added that he felt the County was in good shape as far as the bridge projects were concerned and he noted that the rehabilitation program scheduled for 2008 and 2009 would address the issues with the bridges rating below the 4.4 condition rating, which was only slightly above what the State considered a poor rating.

Mr. Tennyson advised that the Middleton Bridge project was unique because most of the bridges listed for TIP funding resulted in a replacement bridge, while the Middleton Bridge was seriously being evaluated to become a bridge removed and not replaced. He said that the future of the Middleton Bridge would be based upon feedback received from the Board of Supervisors, Public Hearings and engineer recommendations. Mr. Tennyson added that he wanted to bring this matter to the Committee's attention because although they were moving forward under the presumption that the Bridge would be replaced, and had been budgeted for replacement as required through the TIP funding process, there was the chance that the bridge could be removed and not replaced. Mr. Lamy added that during the Budget process the Committee had approved \$250,000 to be placed in a Capital Reserve project for bridge maintenance and those funds would be used to take care of those bridges rating just slightly above the 4.4 condition rating and they were developing a

work plan to advance those repairs.

Mr. Haskell noted that approximately one-third of the bridges in Warren County were listed as being over 60 years old according to this chart and that statistic made him very uneasy.

Mr. Tennyson directed the Committee members to page 34 of the agenda which reflected a copy of the letter received from Assemblywoman Teresa Sayward announcing the availability of applications for the Safe Routes to School Program. He explained that this program had the potential to impact any DPW project within two miles of a school as those schools could apply for funding through this program to piggyback with qualifying road and bridge projects. Mr. Tennyson said that the grant funds would have to be pursued by the schools and there were also many different types of costs that would qualify for grant funding through this program. Mr. Tennyson stated that this item was being presented for the Committee's information because there were several DPW projects planned for areas within two miles of the surrounding schools and they could potentially access funds through the schools to aid in those projects.

Mr. Lamy advised that on page 35 of the agenda he had included a copy of the letter sent by Julie Pacyna, Warren County Purchasing Agent, to Winchip Overhead Door Company, Inc. advising that their contract with the County provided an option for the renewal and/or extension of the contract for two one-year extensions. He explained that the letter had been returned by Winchip, indicating their wish to renew the contract for the term commencing May 1, 2008 and terminating April 30, 2009. Mr. Lamy added that the only difference in the contract upon renewal would be a slight escalation in the hourly labor rate charged through the contract from \$67.50 to \$69.00. He noted that only Committee approval was required for the extension of this contract.

Motion was made by Mr. Stec, seconded by Mr. Haskell and carried unanimously to approve the request to renew the contract with Winchip Overhead Door Company, Inc. for the term commencing May 1, 2008 and terminating April 30, 2009.

Proceeding with the agenda review, Mr. Lamy advised that page 37 included a copy of the letter received from Robert M. Blais, Mayor of the Village of Lake George, notifying that the Village was considering closing Canada Street for the Americade 2008 event. He said that he was simply passing this along for the Committee's information as he did not feel this would require any DPW action. Although, Mr. Lamy noted, some action might be required of the Sheriff's Office and the Office of Emergency Services if the Village decided to proceed with this action for the event.

Mr. Lamy advised that page 38 of the agenda reflected a request for a new contract with Green Thumb Nursery, Inc. for tree removal services for the term commencing February 15, 2008 and terminating December 31, 2008. He noted that this was the same vendor they had used for 2007 and an extension of the expiring contract had been offered; however, he said, the vendor had preferred that the contract be re-bid. Mr. Lamy stated that the services had been re-bid with Green Thumb Nursery, Inc. remaining the low bidder, although the gap had closed tremendously between the second and third lowest bidders. Mr. Belden asked how the services provided by Green Thumb Nursery, Inc. compared to the previous vendor and Mr. Lamy replied that although this had been debated extensively, they had determined that the service received was satisfactory and it was their opinion that it would not be appropriate to reject the bid based on service.

Motion was made by Mr. Haskell, seconded by Mr. Stec and carried unanimously to approve the request for a new contract with Green Thumb Nursery, Inc. for tree removal services for the term commencing February 1, 2008 and terminating December 31, 2008, with allowances for two one-year extensions, and the necessary

resolution was authorized for the February 15th Board meeting. *A copy of the request is on file with the minutes.*

Included on pages 39 and 40, Mr. Lamy stated, were requests for new contracts with Chemung Supply Corp. and Expanded Supply Products, Inc. both for box beam guide railing, posts and hardware. He added that both of the contracts requested would commence on February 15, 2008 and terminate on December 31, 2008.

Motion was made by Mr. Champagne, seconded by Mr. Tessier and carried unanimously to approve both request for contracts with Chemung Supply Corp. and Expanded Supply Products, Inc. as outlined above and the necessary resolutions were authorized for the February 15th Board meeting. *Copies of both requests are on file with the minutes.*

Mr. Lamy advised that page 43 of the agenda reflected a graph entitled "Bridge Service Life Extension Through Effective Maintenance" that had come from the State report on the matter. He said that this graph fit together nicely with the one distributed by Mr. Tennyson earlier in the meeting and he noted that from this document one could see that the money spent on bridges in fair condition to extend their service life would reap long-term financial benefits for the County.

Referring to the Winter Conference he and Mr. Tennyson had recently attended, Mr. Lamy advised that they had partaken of many informational sessions on topics such as bridge maintenance funding, workplace violence, locally administered Federal aid pass-through projects, emission control on vehicles for the year 2010, as well as safety in public works operations. He said that they had also received a report on the status of CHIPS (Consolidated Local Street and Highway Improvement Program) funding, a copy of which was included on page 44 of the agenda. Mr. Lamy stated that the report indicated that Warren County was currently earmarked to receive \$33,370 less in CHIPS funding than was received in 2007. He noted that the County Highway Superintendent's Association, coupled with the Town Highway Superintendents and representatives of the Construction Industry, had advocacy meetings planned for March 4 and 5, 2008 where they would visit the State Legislature in an attempt to not only get the funding restored, but also enhanced. Mr. Lamy added that these efforts had been beneficial in the past and the groups were prepared to make the same attempts for 2008.

Mr. Lamy stated that the final agenda item listed pertained to the referrals from prior Committee meetings, and he noted that he had recently been advised of a referral made from the Public Safety Committee regarding the position of Handicap Coordinator. Mr. Belden advised that this item had been referred in order to determine the duties entailed under this title as no one on the Public Safety Committee was aware of the specifications of the position. Joan Sady, Clerk of the Board, noted that this position had previously been filled by John Farrell, retired Director of Civil Defense, and although they felt that it should be included under the Department of Fire Prevention & Building Code Enforcement, they were not sure of the duties performed by the Handicap Coordinator. Mr. Lamy advised that he would research the matter and return to the Committee with his findings.

Continuing with the remaining referrals listed on page 45 of the agenda, Mr. Lamy detailed them as follows:

- 1) Regarding the status of the Corinth Road Project, Mr. Lamy advised that this item had been reviewed earlier in the meeting and the ROW process was ongoing;
- 2) Mr. Lamy said that the Budget Performance Report would be provided at the end of the quarter as requested by the Committee;
- 3) A handout on bio-diesel fuels and their use by the County was included in the agenda, Mr.

Lamy apprised, subsequent to a request made by Mr. Gabriels, who was a former Committee member. He said that the documentation provided explained his feeling that the use of bio-diesel fuels deserved further consideration by the Committee at this time as they did not see either an environmental or economic benefit over the current low sulfur fuels used. Mr. Lamy asked the Committee members to review this information at their leisure and contact him with any questions; however, he added, he felt that this item could be removed from the referral listing and Mr. Haskell agreed;

- 4) Mr. Lamy advised that, with regard to the possibility of selling unused DPW equipment online, he intended to contact the Auctioneer to discuss the matter due to the level of equipment turnover that would occur due to the new purchases being bonded. He said that he would keep the Committee informed of his findings.

As Mr. Lamy advised that he had no further DPW business to present, Mr. Belden announced that the meeting would adjourn for a short break.

Committee adjourned from 10:40 a.m. to 10:50 a.m.

Upon reconvening, privilege of the floor was extended to Marshall Stevens, Airport Manager, who distributed copies of the Airport agenda to the Committee members. *A copy of the Airport agenda is on file with the minutes.*

Mr. Stevens began the agenda review by advising that the first item listed referred to the rehabilitation of Runway 12-30 and three related requests to increase the Capital Project and award two construction contracts for the project. He explained that there was a Federal grant in place to perform the project which had been established during the prior year to begin the independent fee estimate contract. Mr. Stevens stated that the first request included was to increase Capital Project H279.9550 280, Construct Runway 12-30 Rehabilitation, in the amount of \$1,481,211, with the sources of funding to be a FAA (Federal Aviation Administration) Grant in the amount of \$1,410,000; a NYSDOT Grant in the amount of \$37,105 and the Local Share of \$34,106.

Motion was made by Mr. Champagne, seconded by Mr. Tessier and carried unanimously to approve the request to increase Capital Project H.279.9550 280 (*Construct Runway 12-30 Rehabilitation*) in the amount of \$1,481,211 as outlined above and refer same to the Finance Committee. *A copy of the request is on file with the minutes.*

Mr. Stevens advised that the next two requests were for new contracts with Kubricky Construction Corporation, for the construction contract which had already received approval from the FAA, and with C&S Engineers, Inc., for the construction administration and construction inspection (CA/CI) contract. He noted that the CA/CI contract had not yet received FAA approval; however, he said, he anticipated that approval once he forwarded the independent fee estimate which found that the fees quoted by C&S Engineers, Inc. were reasonable.

Motion was made by Mr. Champagne, seconded by Mr. Tessier and carried unanimously to approve both requests for new contracts with Kubricky Construction Corporation and C&S Engineers, Inc. and the necessary resolutions were authorized for the February 15th Board meeting. *Copies of both requests are on file with the minutes.*

Proceeding to the second item listed, Mr. Stevens explained that the agenda included two requests in relation

to Capital Project H264.9550 280, Runway 1 Safety Area Wetland Mitigation Project, which had been ongoing for almost two years. He said that they had received permits from the engineering staff and NYSDEC (New York State Department of Environmental Conservation) that allow the wetlands at the end of Runway 1 Safety Area to be filled and in return they would both use and enhance wetlands created in the industrial park in the Phase 2 area in prior years. In order to do this Mr. Stevens explained, an additional contract was necessary to design the mitigation, to administer the construction of those mitigation services and to perform long-term monitoring under the conditions of the permit. He noted that although this issue was not completely resolved, he wanted to bring forward the requests to increase the capital project and approve the contract for the necessary work as this would be his final Committee meeting. Mr. Stevens advised that page seven of the agenda included a request to increase Capital Project H264.9550 280, Construction of Runway 1 Safety Area, in the amount of \$110,000 with the source of funding to be a FAA Grant in the amount of \$104,500; a NYSDOT Grant in the amount of \$2,750 and the Local Share of \$2,750. He then presented the request for a new contract with C&S Engineers, Inc. for an amount not to exceed \$110,000 for design, construction inspection and monitoring services for wetland mitigation in relation to Capital Project H265.9550 280, Construction of Runway 1 Safety Area.

Mr. Stevens asked that these requests be approved contingent on two factors; the first of which was FAA approval and he explained that the FAA had advised that they would not amend the grant agreement until the construction project was complete, at which point the FAA would normally allow up to a 15% contingency in the grants. He said that there should be no issue with this matter as both the contract and the construction costs would be well within the 15% contingency. As for the contract requested with C&S Engineers, Inc., Mr. Stevens advised that their contract itself would have two triggers; the first would be for the notice to proceed and allow them to do the design, construction inspection and monitoring in relation to the project. He said that the second trigger included in the contract accounted for a cost for optional bid services and he noted that if they were able to get to a point in the contract where the wetland work could not be negotiated with the current contractor they would have the option to bid those services out to get a lower price. However, Mr. Stevens noted, if they did not require these negotiations, the notice to proceed would not be given and C&S Engineering, Inc. would never expend those monies.

Mr. Stevens apprised that they had held some significant negotiations with C&S Engineering, Inc. regarding this contract and his recommendation was that the contract be authorized to include cost plus fixed fees for both C&S Engineering, Inc. and the sub-consultants used. He explained that the reason for this was that C&S Engineering, Inc. had built a large amount of hours into the project for administration and coordination due to the extensive coordination and work transferred between the project engineers and NYSDEC since the start of the project. Mr. Stevens reiterated that the contract included allowances for administration and coordination fees, which if not needed would not be expended. He said that although there were a lot of contingencies involved in the project he wanted to be sure that it was advanced prior to his leaving the County.

Motion was made by Mr. Stec, seconded by Mr. Tessier and carried unanimously to approve the request to increase Capital Project H264.9550 280, Construction of Runway 1 Safety Area, in the amount of \$110,000 as outlined above and refer same to the Finance Committee. *A copy of the request is on file with the minutes.*

Motion was made by Mr. Stec, seconded by Mr. Tessier and carried unanimously to approve the request for a new contract with C&S Engineering, Inc. for an amount not to exceed \$110,000 for design, construction inspection and monitoring services for wetland mitigation in relation to Capital Project H264.9550 280, and the necessary resolution was authorized for the February 15th Board meeting. *A copy of the request is on file with the minutes.*

Mr. Stevens advised that agenda item three referred to the lease of the old maintenance hangar to Northeast LSA pursuant to the decision made by the Committee during the prior year to develop an RFP (Request for Proposal) for such purposes. He said that he had drafted a lease agreement, although he had not yet forwarded it to Northeast LSA, who had been the successful bidder, because he was awaiting a response from the County Attorney's Office on the matter. Mr. Stevens stated that they were not yet ready for a resolution approving the lease agreement because it had not yet been approved; however, he said he did have some other issues regarding the matter to discuss with the Committee. He apprised that he had used the old FBO (Fixed Based Operator) agreement as a model to develop the draft agreement and there were two areas in question, the first of which were the utilities. Mr. Stevens said that they had made it very clear in the RFP that the utility costs would be the responsibility of the lessee, which was very simple for the propane heat; however, he pointed out, the electricity was currently set through the County's meter with a separate service fee. He advised that they could change this to a separate meter, although there would be some costs associated with this change, of which he did not have an estimate but he did not feel they would be significant. Mr. Stevens stated that based on his discussions with the potential lessee, he did not think that the electricity use would be substantial, basically only for lights and a computer, and he left it to the Committee to determine whether an additional meter should be installed.

Mr. Haskell stated that it was his opinion that an additional meter should be installed for the hangar as the County intended to lease the building in the future and they could not estimate what utility use future lessees would require. He said that it was better to go ahead and add a separate meter now and he agreed with Mr. Stevens' statement that there should not be a significant cost to add the meter.

Motion was made by Mr. Haskell, seconded by Mr. Stec and carried unanimously to authorize a separate electricity meter to be installed for the old maintenance hangar.

Mr. Stevens stated that the second area of question regarding the lease agreement were the requests proposed by the potential lessee. He said that requests for cosmetic repairs to the building, which was an old concrete building, and repairs could most likely be made by County staff; potential roof repairs, which could not be made by County staff as the building had a rubber membrane roof, and assurances that the structure was sound. Mr. Stevens said that prior to the RFP being released he had requested that a DPW engineer review the building to determine the integrity of the structure, at which time he was advised that the only way to make a true analysis of this was to do some destructive testing by tearing down some of the concrete to view the steel structure underneath. He noted that these requests had the potential to incur considerable costs, especially in consideration of the proposed rental fee which was only \$600 per month. Mr. Stevens stated that in his estimation it would take several years of this rent to offset these costs of the repairs requested and an alternative option might be to lease the building on an as-is basis, possibly providing some cosmetic repairs such as painting, which could be done by County staff.

Mr. Belden asked if DPW staff had reviewed the hangar to determine the costs for repairs and Mr. Lamy replied that he thought William Remington, prior DPW Superintendent, had made such a report. Mr. Stevens advised that a report had been developed by Mr. Remington, although he did not have a copy of it on hand and would have to search his files for it as it was developed some time ago. He added that he seemed to recall the cost estimates in the range of \$5,000 to \$10,000.

Discussion ensued with respect to the matter.

Mr. Belden asked Mr. Lamy to visit the hangar when the weather was more conducive to determine what costs would be associated with repairs to the old maintenance hangar and return to the Committee with cost

estimates.

Resuming the review of the agenda, Mr. Stevens advised that page 15 included a request for a new contract with Linstar, Inc. for a service agreement for the airport access control system which included all mechanized gates and the two terminal doors. He explained that this was the same agreement that had been in place for 2007; however, he noted, the price had increased slightly. Mr. Stevens said that the contract included preventative maintenance and on-call service for anything that was not damaged by acts of God or lightning.

Motion was made by Mr. Stec, seconded by Mr. Champagne and carried unanimously to approve the request for a new contract with Linstar, Inc. in the amount of \$1,550 for a service agreement for the airport access control system to commence upon execution and terminate on December 31, 2008 and the necessary resolution was authorized for the February 15th Board meeting. *A copy of the request is on file with the minutes.*

Mr. Stevens advised that although they had other leasing arrangements in place with Empire East Aviation, Kim Lussier, President of Empire East Aviation, had proposed a separate agreement to lease property for the construction of 10 to 20 T-Hangars. He said that Mr. Lussier had provided a detailed set of stormwater plans engineered for this purpose and they had been made aware of the building type he proposed for the T-hangars. Mr. Stevens said that Mr. Lussier had contacted engineers to produce foundation plans for their review and he was also working on his financing package for the project which would be reviewed during an executive session at a future Committee meeting. He added that no further information was available on the project presently; however, he said, he wanted the Committee to be aware of the status of the proposal.

Proceeding to the New Business portion of the agenda, Mr. Stevens advised that item number six referred to additional interest in T-Hangar development and he advised that beginning on page 20 of the agenda he had included a copy of the letter received from another group seeking an arrangement similar to the one the County had with Mr. Lussier for the lease of property. He said that he had met with the individuals seeking the arrangement and had advised that the County had already filed a non-binding letter of intent with Mr. Lussier indicating the area in which he wished to construct his T-hangars and that they were willing to move forward with the proposed agreement and that Mr. Lussier would have first priority as he had already expended funds in relation to the project and he did not feel that it was in the best interest of the County to negate the arrangement. Mr. Stevens said that they had already identified another area beyond the area chosen by Mr. Lussier where this group could potentially build their T-hangars and the next step would be for this group to be allowed to perform the preliminary engineering studies required as well as providing design plans and financial information, which was the beginning of the process. Mr. Stevens said that the good news was that they were getting necessary facilities at the Airport and doing so at a very low cost to the County; basically the arrangement was that the County would be responsible for the paving to the T-hangars while the lessee was responsible for everything else, including the sub-base and drainage work needed for the buildings.

Discussion ensued with respect to the matter.

Motion was made by Mr. Haskell, seconded by Mr. Stec and carried unanimously to authorize additional studies to be performed at the expense of Tom Longe and Merile Latterell, who wish to lease property at the Airport for the construction of T-hangars.

Mr. Stevens began his review of items pending from prior Committee meetings, which he detailed as follows:

- 1) With regard to the Chartrand Parcel, Mr. Stevens reminded the Committee that there had been an ongoing dispute between the County and a property owner over an easement to the

- Airport property. He said that the matter had been referred to the County Attorney's Office along with the authorization to proceed with legal action, and he had no update further than this.
- 2) Mr. Stevens said that during the prior year they had filed a Notice of Intent under the Nationwide SWPPP (Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan); unfortunately, he said, one of the negative impacts of this plan was that they could not wash vehicles or aircrafts with soap that would discharge into the stormwater system. He said that they were working on a solution which he had discussed with Mr. Tennyson to create some sort of concrete washpad with dual drainage to allow for water to drain to the sewer system when vehicles were being washed and to the stormwater system at other times. Mr. Stevens said that both NYSDEC and Sewer Authority had indicated tentative approval; however, he said, they wanted the system to be as foolproof as possible. He said that DPW intended to put together a tentative design in-house and determine a cost estimate for such for presentation to the Committee at a future meeting.
 - 3) One outstanding issue for 2008, Mr. Stevens stated, was the fact that the FBO contract was to expire on December 31, 2008. He said that an RFP should be put out in the near future, and although he did not anticipate that he would have time to complete the process prior to the end of his tenure at the Airport, he did intend to draft an outline of the RFP for Mr. Lamy before leaving. Mr. Stevens said that it was important that the next Airport Manager have a part in the RFP process for the next FBO. Mr. Belden asked when the RFP should be issued and Mr. Stevens replied that he thought the RFP should be done in April or May to leave the Committee sufficient time for the selection, interview and negotiation processes to ensure that the contract would be in place by the end of the year. Mr. Haskell asked if there was an extension clause on the current FBO contract and Mr. Stevens replied in the negative, noting that the contract had included an allowance for only one extension, which they had already executed.
 - 4) Mr. Stevens advised that he had received a request during the prior year from a car club requesting use of a portion of the field located in front of the Airport outside of the fence for their "Cruise-Ins" and at that time the Committee had requested further information with respect to the request. He said that since that time he had attempted to get this information; however, he had not yet received it.

Mr. Belden acknowledged that this would be Mr. Stevens' final Committee meeting and he thanked him for the outstanding service he had provided to the County during his tenure as Airport Manager. He also extended his best wishes to Mr. Stevens in his next venture and he noted that Mr. Stevens would surely be missed and the Committee echoed these sentiments.

Mr. Belden noted that Mr. Stevens was named as a representative of Warren County on the NYSAC (New York State Association of Counties) Public Safety Committee and he said that it was very important for someone to be named to replace Mr. Stevens in this position upon his departure. He then asked Mr. Lamy to meet with Mr. Stevens to determine an appropriate nomination for this representative position. Mr. Lamy asked how Mr. Stevens had become designated as Warren County's NYSAC representative and Mr. Stevens replied that he had been nominated by Bruce Geiger, NYSAC Legislative Liaison and Representative of the New York Aviation Management Association, as an airport voice on the Committee. Mr. Lamy advised that he would discuss the matter with Mr. Stevens and bring their nomination forward at a future Committee meeting.

Mr. Lamy pointed out that during the Budget process there had been a reduction in the Equipment Rental

Code which had to be recovered prior to the Adirondack Balloon Festival as the funds removed were used to cover the costs of portable restrooms and light towers necessary for the event. He said that in speaking with the Budget Officer they had determined that there was a misunderstanding that had led to the reduction; however, he said, the funds would have to be transferred from another source as these items were absolutely necessary for the Balloon Festival. Mr. Belden said that Mr. Lamy should determine a source of funding to transfer the funds and address any shortage caused at the close of 2008.

Mr. Tessier advised that he had received a letter from the Glens Falls Owner's & Pilot's Association requesting that they be allowed a voice in determining the next Airport Manager, as well as a resume for a person seeking the position, both of which he gave to Mr. Lamy for consideration. Mr. Lamy stated that they had advertised the Airport Manager position and received several applications which they had been screening to determine an order for interviews and he noted that the resume presented by Mr. Tessier had already been received and was being considered. As for the request to allow the Glens Falls Owner's & Pilot's Association to have a voice in determining the next Airport Manager, Mr. Lamy asked the Committee how they felt about this. Mr. Haskell advised that because taxpayer dollars were going to be spent to fund the position, he felt that the Committee should make the decision as to who should be hired, with no input from this Association.

Robert Singer, of the Glens Falls Owner's & Pilots Association, addressed the Committee, expressing the Association's gratitude and best wishes to Mr. Stevens and he noted that the Airport had been run well during his tenure. He then stated their support for Mr. Lussier, whom he said had run the FBO better than it had been in many years. Mr. Singer said that the letter received by Mr. Tessier, sent by the President of the Glens Falls Owner's & Pilot's Association, represented a general offer of support, not specifically for the selection Committee. He said that his Association was very interested in the Airport, and he noted that his personal interest was based on the fact that he lived in Glens Falls while his job was located in Buffalo and because he commuted there on a weekly basis he was dependent upon the Airport to keep his job and live where he preferred. Mr. Singer said they were offering general support, advice and concern because the Airport was very important to this group of people.

Mr. Belden thanked Mr. Singer for his comments and Mr. Monroe stated that it would be very good to keep this group aware of when the meetings were and also to note that they were open to the public so that they might attend.

Mr. Champagne stated that he had no issue with accepting public input in deciding upon a replacement for Mr. Stevens. He said Mr. Stevens did an excellent job in managing the Airport and it was his hope that he would use that criteria in determining who the new manager would be. Mr. Champagne said that because he had no idea what qualities to look for in an Airport Manager, it was his feeling that those residents who utilized the Airport and knew what criteria was necessary to best fit the job should not be discouraged from giving their input to make the best decision. He said that there might be some advantage to this input to enhance the process.

Chairman Monroe stated that although the members of the Glens Falls Owner's and Pilot's Association certainly could not have a vote on who should be hired for the position, they could review resumes and make recommendation on who they felt would be best suited for the position.

Mr. Belden asked how many resumes had been received for the position and Mr. Lamy replied that there were 10. Mr. Lamy added that he and Mr. Stevens would continue to meet to review the applications and determine who would be the best candidates for the position.

Mr. Belden advised that Mr. Singer should leave his personal contact information with Mr. Lamy so that the Glens Falls Owner's and Pilot's Association could be contacted.

As there was no further business to present, Mr. Stevens left the meeting at 11:18 a.m.

Privilege of the floor was extended to Paul Butler, Director of Parks, Recreation & Railroad who distributed copies of the agenda to the Committee members. *A copy of the agenda is on file with the minutes.*

Mr. Butler advised that the first portion of the agenda referred to the Warren County Fish Hatchery and he advised that the agenda included charts detailing the yearling fish stocking history as well as the size range of the rainbow trout produced by the Hatchery, which he reviewed with the Committee.

Mr. Haskell advised that previously, when Pat Beland was Director of Parks, Recreation & Railroad, they had met with NYSDEC regarding the fish produced by the Hatchery, at which time they were advised that any fish produced over the 31,350 fish allowed by the NYSDEC stocking permit, must be inhumanely destroyed by burying them, which he found disturbing. He said that they had requested permission to stock other water sources, in order to avoid such destruction of any fish over the amount authorized through the stocking permit; however, permission to do so was refused. Mr. Haskell said that subsequent to this finding the decision had been made to keep the production numbers for stocking as close to the number allotted by the NYSDEC permits as possible. He apprised that he had received a letter from the Warren County Conservation Council (WCCC) complaining that the County was not stocking as many, or as large, fish as they had in the past and in answer to those complaints Mr. Haskell said he had requested that Mr. Butler produce these numbers. Mr. Haskell said that the root of the WCCC's complaints were based on their assumption that the Fish Hatchery was not producing as many or as large as they had in the past, which was not correct. He said that the hatchery figures had reduced, but only to keep the number as close as possible to the number their permit allowed. Mr. Haskell stated that these issues had been brought forth by a disgruntled employee who had advised the WCCC that this was the case, which was not factual.

Mr. Lamy stated that Mr. Butler and himself had met with members of the WCCC and had gone through some of previous operations and they felt they were on target to meet the stocking permit figure for 2008. He added that things were working well with the fish based on the strain they were receiving from the Federal Hatchery and they anticipated a successful stocking season.

Discussion ensued with respect to the matter.

Mr. Butler said that in light of the complaints citing the lack of fish and the perception that the fish caught are smaller, they had been asked to consider releasing 18 month-old fish rather than 12 month-old to stock larger fish and he asked the Committee for direction on this. Mr. Belden advised that Mr. Butler should determine the costs that would be incurred to hold the fish for an additional 6 months and return to the Committee with his findings.

Moving along, Mr. Butler apprised that the agenda included charts reflecting the annual visitation and revenue history for Up Yonda Farm. He said that they'd had a very good year for 2007, in fact it had been the second best year for both visitation and revenue in the County's history. Mr. Butler pointed out that in 2005, 2006 and 2007 the Up Yonda Farm had received Glens Falls 21st Century Grant funding for the No Child Left Behind Program and this was the difference for the influx in income.

Mr. Butler advised that the next section of the agenda pertained to the Upper Hudson River Railroad

(UHRR) and he noted that he had included a copy of the letter received from UHRR regarding their request for exclusive use of the Kellogg property for the period beginning May 7, 2008 and ending June 8, 2008 for their Day Out with Thomas event. He added that they had also requested closure of the County road that ran through the property from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. on May 23 - 25 and May 30 - June 1.

Motion was made by Haskell, seconded by Mr. Stec and carried unanimously to approve the request of UHRR for exclusive use of the Kellogg property and closure of the County road running through it as outlined above.

Charts reflecting UHRR ticket sales revenue were also included in the agenda, Mr. Butler advised. He said that the first chart reflected sales with the Day Out with Thomas event and the second chart without. Mr. Butler added that the Thomas event had significantly increased revenues for UHRR. Mr. Haskell pointed out that regular ticket sales did not include all events in which the train was involved. He said that income for special events, such as the Polar Express ride, was collected solely by UHRR.

Mr. Butler announced that the next section of the agenda pertained to the Kellogg Property and he advised that a draft transfer agreement for the property had been received and was currently being reviewed by the County Attorney's Office. He said that once the transfer agreement had been approved by the County Attorney, it would be presented to the Committee.

Mr. Belden noted that the property had been discussed in a prior Planning & Community Development meeting with regard to grant funding that had been applied for. He said that he had a problem with this because they were applying for grant funding for property the County did not yet own and he asked Mr. Butler when the property would be transferred. Mr. Butler replied that he would suspect that the property would be turned over to the County within the next month or two.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Butler said that the agenda included a document entitled "Kellogg Building Project" which included the costs for improvements to the property, specifically the T-building, which was the southernmost building on the property. He said that they had done some renovations in the past and he had included \$10,000 in his 2008 Budget to continue those renovations; however, he said those funds had been removed in budget process. Mr. Butler noted that the preliminary cost estimates listed, of approximately \$40,000, included basic electrical work, siding, framing, sheetrock, insulation and paint costs, as well as two heating units, which represented a large portion of the costs estimated. He added that a special oil tank setup would be required for the heating system because the property was located close to the Hudson River.

Mr. Belden asked if there were funds Budgeted for this project and Mr. Butler replied in the negative, reiterating that he had initially included \$10,000 in his Budget request but it had been removed prior to adoption. Mr. Butler noted that Wayne LaMothe, Assistant Director of Planning & Community Development, had submitted a grant application for funds to cover these costs and it was estimated that an answer would be received as to whether the funds were available in early spring. Mr. Belden asked if the grant would require matching funds and Mr. Butler replied affirmatively. Mr. Lamy pointed out that these expenses would be for material items and if they could use County labor to facilitate the work they could use the expenses of the work as the matching funds needed to appease the grant requirements. Mr. Butler stated that as he understood it the grant application submitted was for \$197,000 and the Local match would be based on the total amount of the grant received. Mr. Belden noted that the work should not begin until an answer was received on the grant and Mr. Butler agreed, adding that he wanted the Committee to be aware of the status of the project and that was why he presented the item.

Mr. Butler advised that construction of two pavilions at the Kellogg property were planned for 2008, for which APA (Adirondack Park Agency) approval had been given provided that the structures remained at least 50 ft. from the watermark. He said that grant funds would be used for this project and he estimated each pavilion to cost approximately \$10,000. Mr. Butler stated that construction would begin on these pavilions as soon as the ground was ready.

Moving on, Mr. Butler stated that the next agenda item pertained to the Hudson Street Cross Country Ski Trails/Nature Trails and he advised that the agenda included a copy of the letter forwarded to Keith Scherer, Director of Community Outreach for the New York State Senate, following their discussion. He said that included with the letter, and in the agenda, were copies of the letter received from NYSDEC refusing permission to use motor vehicles on State lands, as well as the letter received from Senator Elizabeth O'C Little reiterating the refusal she had received from NYSDEC in her personal attempt to gain such permissions. Mr. Butler advised that he was attempting to contact James Cronin, owner of Cronin's Golf Course to work out an agreement that would allow grooming of the trails from the golf course.

Mr. Belden suggested that the Chairman of the Board be authorized to send a letter to their legislative parties in attempt to gain the necessary permissions from NYSDEC and Mr. Lamy replied that this had already been done and still refusals had been received from NYSDEC. Mr. Haskell noted that it seemed that if the County was advertising the use of the cross-country trails they were responsible for the grooming of them. Mr. Lamy stated that by working out an agreement with Mr. Cronin they would be able to groom the trails on the golf course; however, he said NYSDEC would not allow the County to use their grooming machines for the trails located on State land.

Mr. Butler advised that the next portion of the agenda pertained to the Rail Stations project and he noted that Mr. Lamy would present this item. Mr. Lamy reminded the Committee that at their last meeting they had asked him to review the potential of DPW staff to become involved in the project at both the Thurman and Hadley Station locations. He said that he and his staff had visited Clough Harbour Associates (CHA) to discuss what work could be performed by County staff and from a technical standpoint there seemed to be a lot of work that could be done if the Committee chose to divert their resources from highways, roads and bridges, as well as putting the duties of the Parks, Recreation and Railroad Department staff on hold.

Mr. Lamy recommended that they bid out the services required for the Thurman Station, which would be the most difficult, and use DPW staff to perform the paving and parking lot striping as well as to move the platform. He said that once the Thurman Station was complete they could determine how much funding was available for the Hadley Station, which he estimated would require about \$100,000 worth of materials to make the site functionally complete, as per the requirement of the grant funds. Mr. Lamy stated that before starting the Hadley Station the existing metal building would have to be removed, as well as a concrete slab that had to be pulverized for removal. He said that National Grid would also have to move a telephone pole and installation of electrical service with a weatherproof panel would be required. He said that once these things had been done it would be appropriate to install waterline connections, rough grading could be done, a stormwater retention pond added, stone could be put in the parking lot, they could pave around the parking lot and erect a canopy that would be compliant. Mr. Lamy stated that these seemed to be the most feasible projects for the DPW subsequent to their review of the work necessary to complete the Station.

Mr. Lamy said that funding would be an issue in the Project as during their review, he and Mrs. Sady had found that of the \$2.5 million beginning budget, (*\$2 million provided by Federal funds and \$500,000 by the County*), only \$1.325 million remained in Federal grant funding. He pointed out that only \$71,000 of the \$500,000 Local Share had been met, leaving a total of \$429,000 to be paid by the County. Mr. Lamy added

that they had reached a point in the project where they could not access any further grant funding until the Local Share was paid.

Mr. Belden asked why the Local Share was not budgeted and Mr. Lamy replied that they had found a previous resolution which had advised that at the point that it was needed, a Bond Anticipation note would be issued. Mr. Belden asked if the Thurman Rail Station would include a complete building and Mr. Lamy replied affirmatively. Mr. Belden then noted that it seemed to him that the busiest stop along the train's route was at 1,000 Acres Resort and that some funding should be used to build a proper platform there. Mr. Haskell replied that County staff had erected a loading ramp at that location already.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Geraghty pointed out that the Board of Supervisors had discussed the need to curb spending to maintain the Budget and he did not think they could justify spending \$500,000 in this economic climate for trains that were facing decreased ridership. He said that if they spent any of that federal money they would have to contribute the Local Share and Mr. Lamy replied that they were behind in paying the Local Share already and regardless of what decision was made they had to meet the grant requirements and pay 20% of the grant funds expended.

Mr. Haskell noted that although from UHRR reports it seemed that ridership was down, they continued to renew their contract with the County and it does not seem that they would do so if the numbers were actually decreasing as presented.

Mr. Belden stated that the Bond Anticipation Note required would be in the neighborhood of \$600,000 to cover the Local Share of the project costs, as well as the \$100,000 that it would cost for DPW to build the Hadley Station. He agreed that these costs needed to be reviewed more closely to determine whether or not to proceed with the project.

Mr. Geraghty asked if studies and reports had been developed to determine the ridership of the trains prior to proceeding with the Rail Station project and Mr. Haskell replied affirmatively, adding that the reports could be accessed through the Planning & Community Development Department. Mr. Haskell added that one of the biggest problems facing the project was that the County had been promised \$2 million in State funding that had never materialized which was supposed to cover the Local Share of the project costs. Mr. Lamy advised that another issue facing the project was that NYSDOT was now looking for the County to show progress with respect to the project. He also advised that regardless of whether or not the County decided to proceed with the project they had to pay the local share of the Federal grant funds already spent which was approximately \$165,000.

Discussion ensued with respect to the matter.

Motion was made by Mr. Haskell, seconded by Mr. Stec and carried unanimously to refer the matter of finding funding to cover the local share of the Rail Station project costs to the Budget Committee for further review.

Mr. Butler advised that the final agenda item referred to the items pending from prior Committee meetings, which he outlined as follows:

- 1) Referring to the sale and removal of the County-owned building located in the Town of Hadley acquired as part of the Warren County Scenic Rail Station Improvements project,

- Mr. Butler advised that this item would remain pending as they were awaiting the Committee's decision on the future of the site. Mr. Merlino advised that he had spoken with representatives of the Town of Hadley with respect to the matter and he had been advised that they wished to have no involvement with the project or the removal of the building.
- 2) Mr. Butler advised that the second pending item pertained to the Thurman Train Station which they had discussed during the meeting and would remain pending prior further discussion and a determination by the Budget Committee.
 - 3) Mr. Haskell advised that he and Mr. Stec had met with Mr. Dusek with regard to the possibility of using Occupancy Tax revenue to pay the fixed expenses of the Warren County Association for Snowmobile Clubs and it had been determined that Mr. Dusek had to research the matter further prior to giving any determination.

As there was no further business to come before the Public Works Committee, on motion made by Mr. Haskell and seconded by Mr. Stec, Mr. Belden adjourned the meeting at 12:10 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,
Amanda Allen, Sr. Legislative Office Specialist